



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/317,746	05/24/1999	ROBERT L. STEWART	CIS-1219	9501

21005 7590 12/20/2002

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.  
530 VIRGINIA ROAD  
P.O. BOX 9133  
CONCORD, MA 01742-9133

EXAMINER

WOO, ISAAC M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2172

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/317,746

Applicant(s)

STEWART ET AL.

Examiner

Isaac M Woo

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 18 October 2002 has been entered.

2. Claims 1-28 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shima (U.S. No. 6,333,789) in view of Lawande et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,219,697, hereinafter, "Lawande") and further in view of Wang et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,448,731, hereinafter, "Wang").

With respect to claims 1, 18, 27 and 28, Shima discloses the method, apparatus and computer program for prioritizing a network management request (priority of information, SNMP request, printer job) sent by a management station (host computer) to a managed element (printer connected via network), see (col. 1, 5-67 to col. 2, lines 1-32), Shima discloses the scheduling the network management request by the managed element (network printer, FIG. 5 and 15, priority table, FIG. 1 and col. 6, lines 26-33) dependent on the assigned priority value, see (FIG. 5, col. 7, lines 30-67 to col. 8, lines 1-31).

Shima discloses the assigning a priority value to the network management request, see (col. 1, lines 65-67 to col. 2, lines 1-21 and FIG. 2A-B, col. 5, lines 31-67 to col. 6, lines 1-33). Shima does not explicitly disclose the requester identifier included in the request. However, Lawande discloses the requester identifier included in the request (FIG. 7B-C; col. 13, lines 37-67 to col. 14, lines 1-49 and col. 17, lines 5-67 to col. 18, lines 1-40), which specifies that TCP/IP packets include source ID to identify sender ID from destination device in network communication using TCP/IP protocol. Neither Shima nor Lawande discloses that the user identifier in a network management wrapper identifying the user of an application from which the request was sent. However, Wang discloses that whenever user request has been made, the user ID is established and determined priority for request, which teaches the user identifier in a network management wrapper identifying the user of an application from which the request was sent, see (FIG. 3, FIG. 4, col. 3, lines 59-67 to col. 4, lines 1-67 to col. 5, lines 1-57). Therefore, based on Shima in view of Lawande and further in view of Wang,

it would have been obvious a person having ordinary skill in the art the time invention was made to include the method of the user identifier in a network management wrapper identifying the user of an application from which the request was sent into the system of Shima and Lawande. In order to communicate in network environment, there must be specific communication protocol that is TCP/IP, which is well known protocol and whenever the user login the system, the system identifies the user ID.

With respect to claims 2, 15, 19 and 24, Shima discloses the assigning is performed by the managed element, see (S12, FIG. 5, col. 7, lines 30-47).

With respect to claims 3 and 20, neither Shima nor Lawande discloses the adding a priority value to an authentication group comprising a plurality of users, in an authentication table. However, Wang discloses the adding a priority value to an authentication group comprising user identification, in an authentication table, see (FIG.3, FIG. 4, col. 3, lines 59-67 to col. 4, lines 1-67 to col. 5, lines 1-57). Therefore, it would have been obvious a person having ordinary skill in the art include the method of the adding a priority value to an authentication comprising user identifications. Thus, it would be beneficial to add the priority values to network user to make prioritizing network management request when the network user makes requests.

With respect to claims 4 and 22, neither Shima nor Lawande discloses the adding a priority value to a user identifier in a source identification table. However,

Wang discloses the adding a priority value to a user identifier in a source identification table, see (FIG. 3, FIG. 4, col. 3, lines 59-67 to col. 4, lines 1-67 to col. 5, lines 1-57).

Therefore, based on Shima in view of Lawande and further in view of Wang, it would have been obvious a person having ordinary skill in the art the time invention was made to include the adding a priority value to a user identifier in a source identification table.

User identifier helps to determine the request's priority checking priority table.

With respect to claims 5 and 21, neither Shima nor Lawande discloses the limitations. However, Wang discloses the extracting a user identifier from the network management request, see (col. 5, lines 1-26);

determining the priority value by using the extracted user identifier to index the authentication table, see (FIG. 3, FIG. 4, col. 3, lines 59-67 to col. 4, lines 1-67 to col. 5, lines 1-57). Therefore, based on Shima in view of Lawande and further in view of Wang, it would have been obvious a person having ordinary skill in the art the time invention was made to include the extracting a user identifier from the network management request; determining the priority value by using the extracted user identifier to index the authentication table. Identifying the user id helps to determine the request's priority checking priority table

With respect to claims 6 and 11, Shima discloses the selecting the order of execution of the network management request dependent on the determined priority value, see (FIG. 5, col. 7, lines 30-67 to col. 8, lines 1-31).

With respect to claims 7 and 12, Shima discloses that preempting the currently executing task if the determined value for the management request is higher than the currently executing task, see (FIG. 5, col. 7, lines 30-67 to col. 8, lines 1-31).

With respect to claims 8-9 and 13-14, Shima discloses the adding a management request to the request queue dependent on priority value, see (S16, FIG. 5 and col. 7, lines 30-67 to col. 8, lines 1-31).

With respect to claims 10 and 23, neither Shima nor Lawande discloses the limitations. However, Wang discloses the extracting the user identifier from the network management request, see (FIG. 3, FIG. 4, col. 3, lines 59-67 to col. 4, lines 1-67 to col. 5, lines 1-57).

determining the priority value by using the extracted user identifier to index the source identification table, see (FIG. 3, FIG. 4, col. 3, lines 59-67 to col. 4, lines 1-67 to col. 5, lines 1-57). Therefore, based on Shima in view of Lawande and further in view of Wang, it would have been obvious a person having ordinary skill in the art the time invention was made to include the extracting a user identifier from the network management request; determining the priority value by using the extracted user identifier to index the source identification table. Identifying the user id helps to determine the request's priority checking priority table

With respect to claims 16 and 25, Shima discloses the storing a priority value in the network management request before sending the network management request to the manage element (5, FIG. 1 and col. 5, lines 4-45).

With respect to claims 17 and 26, Shima discloses the extracting the priority value from the network management request; and

scheduling the network management request dependent on the extracted priority value, see (FIG. 5, col. 7, lines 30-67 to col. 8, lines 1-31).

### ***Conclusion***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Angal et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,999,978) discloses the system for access control database that defines access rights through the use of access control objects. The access control objects include group objects, each defining a group and a set of users who are members of the group, and rule objects. A first subset of the rule objects each specify a set of the group objects, a set of the management objects, and access rights by the users who are members of the groups defined by the specified set of the group objects to the specified set of management objects. The access control server responds to the access requests from the users by granting, denying and partially granting and denying the access requested in each access request in accordance with the access



Art Unit: 2172

rights specified in the access control database. A second subset of the rule objects in the access control database each specify user access rights to event notifications generated by the specified set of management objects. An event registry is used for registering event notification requests by users, each event notification request specifying event notifications from specified sets of the management objects that are being requested. An event router receives event notifications generated by the management objects. It responds to each event notification by sending corresponding event notification messages to users who have registered a corresponding event notification request with the event registry and also have access rights to the received event notification in accordance with the access rights specified in the access control database.


***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isaac M Woo whose telephone number is (703) 305-0081. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y Vu can be reached on (703) 305-4393. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 308-6606 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

IMW  
December 12, 2002

  
JEAN M. CORRIELUS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER